| | 1 |
|---|---|
| | 2 |
| | 3 |
| | 4 |
| | 5 |
| | 6 |
| | 7 |
| | 8 |
| | 9 |
| 1 | 0 |
| 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 2 |
| 1 | 3 |
| 1 | 4 |
| 1 | 5 |
| 1 | 6 |
| 1 | 7 |
| | 8 |
| 1 | 9 |
| 2 | 0 |
| 2 | 1 |
| 2 | 2 |
| 2 | 3 |
| 2 | 4 |
| 2 | 5 |
| 2 | 6 |
| 2 | 7 |

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

| ETIENNE A. SULLIVAN, | Case No. 2:16-cv-02985-RFB-NJK |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Plaintiff(s), | |
| v. | ORDER |
| CIT BANK, N.A., et al., | (Docket No. 56) |
| Defendant(s). | |

Pending before the Court is the parties' stipulation to stay discovery pending Plaintiff and Defendant Cit Bank, N.A.'s settlement conference. Docket No. 56. The parties request the Court to extend discovery by 90 days after the settlement conference. Id. at 3. Although the Court has broad discretionary power to control discovery, discovery is close to completion in this case. See, e.g., Little v. City of Seattle, 863 F.2d 681, 685 (9th Cir.1988). Moreover, the parties had begun to schedule deposition discovery prior to filing their request for a settlement conference. Id. Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** the parties' stipulation to stay discovery. *Id.*

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: October 31, 2017

28

Nancy J. Koppe

United States Magistrate Judge